



OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

Fiscal Note

Fiscal Note On: **SB 98** SLS 09RS 246
Bill Text Version: **ORIGINAL**
Opp. Chamb. Action:
Proposed Amd.:
Sub. Bill For.:

Date: May 3, 2009 5:03 PM	Author: QUINN
Dept./Agy.: Local Taxing Authorities	Analyst: Robert Trahan
Subject: Roll forward of Millage	

TAX/AD VALOREM OR SEE FISC NOTE LF Page 1 of 1
Constitutional amendment to prohibit the "rolling forward" of property tax millages by taxing authorities without approval of the electorate in an amount which would cause tax collections to exceed the percentage increase in the Consumer Price

Purpose of Bill: To limit the roll forward of a millage so that total taxes collected do not exceed the percentage increase in the consumer price index for the immediate preceding year.

To be submitted to the electors at the statewide election to be held on November 2, 2010.

EXPENDITURES	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	5 -YEAR TOTAL
State Gen. Fd.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Agy. Self-Gen.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ded./Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Local Funds	SEE BELOW	SEE BELOW	SEE BELOW	SEE BELOW	SEE BELOW	
Annual Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

REVENUES	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	5 -YEAR TOTAL
State Gen. Fd.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Agy. Self-Gen.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ded./Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Local Funds	SEE BELOW	SEE BELOW	SEE BELOW	SEE BELOW	SEE BELOW	
Annual Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

EXPENDITURE EXPLANATION

There is no anticipated material effect on governmental expenditures as a result of this measure.

An official with the Secretary of State’s Office informed us that putting this item on the November 2010 ballot would involve no additional expenditure from the state or local government.

REVENUE EXPLANATION

If approved by the electorate, taxing authorities may lose the incremental revenue it would have collected by “rolling forward” to the maximum millage rate as allowed under the current law if total taxes collected would be greater than the percentage increase in the consumer price index for the immediate preceding year.

Example:

If the following taxing districts were limited to a 2.8% increase in CPI (increase for 2007), and not allowed to roll forward up to the maximum millage rate, the potential loss for each taxing district could have been:

- 1) Jefferson Parish School Board – (Only reviewed one of four different millages assessed by the School Board) Up to \$4,521,004 (Maximum millage rate \$28,583,085 – Limit per increase in CPI for 2007 \$24,062,081)
- 2) Bossier Parish Assessment District – Up to \$177,242 (Maximum millage rate \$2,386,856 – Limit per increase in CPI for 2007 \$2,209,616)

Senate	Dual Referral Rules	House	
<input type="checkbox"/> 13.5.1 >= \$500,000 Annual Fiscal Cost		<input type="checkbox"/> 6.8(F) >= \$500,000 Annual Fiscal Cost	 Joy Irwin Director of Advisory Services
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 13.5.2 >= \$500,000 Annual Tax or Fee Change		<input type="checkbox"/> 6.8(G) >= \$500,000 Tax or Fee Increase or a Net Fee Decrease	